arXiv:1408.4356v2 [math.AP] 20 Aug 2014

SOME RESULTS ON P-CONVEXITY AND THE PROBLEM OF PARAMETER DEPENDENCE FOR SOLUTIONS OF LINEAR PARTIAL DIFFERENTIAL EQUATIONS

T. KALMES

Abstract. We provide a sufficient condition for P-convexity for (singular) supports for an open subset $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ in terms of the minimum principle for the boundary distance of X. Contrary to the general case (see [8]), this allows us to prove for certain semi-elliptic differential operators $P(D)$, including the heat operator, and for differential operators acting along a subspace of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and being elliptic there, resp., that surjectivity of $P(D)$ on $\mathscr{D}'(X)$ implies surjectivity of the augmented operator $P^+(D)$ on $\mathscr{D}'(X\times\mathbb{R})$. Thus, we solve in the affirmative the problem of parameter dependence for solutions of differential equations [1, Problem 9.1] for these classes of differential operators.

1. Introduction

A classical result by Malgrange [9, Chapitre 1, Théorème 4] from 1955 states that for a polynomial $P \in \mathbb{C}[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ and for an open set $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ the constant coefficient differential operator $P(D) : C^\infty(X) \to C^\infty(X)$ is surjective if and only if X is P-convex for supports, that is, if and only if for every compact subset K of X there is another compact subset L of X such that for each compactly supported distribution $u \in \mathscr{E}'(X)$ with $\operatorname{supp} P(-D)u \subseteq K$ it holds $\operatorname{supp} u \subseteq L$.

Although this characterization is almost 60 years old, there are very few differential operators $P(D)$ for which there is a satisfactory geometric evaluation of this condition for a given open $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$. Convex open sets are P-convex for supports, whenever $P \neq 0$, every open set is P-convex for supports whenever P is elliptic, and there is a complete geometric characterization of P-convexity for supports in the two dimensional case due to Hörmander [5, Theorem 10.8.3]. In arbitrary dimensions, there is a characterization for second order operators with principal part equal to the wave operator [5, Theorem 10.8.6], which is essentially due to Persson [12]. In [13], Persson extended the characterization of P-convexity for supports for the wave operator to arbitrary operators of real principle type in $\mathbb{R}^3$, while Tintarev [15], [14] evaluated P-convexity for supports for operators of real principal type for bounded open sets X with analytic boundary, and for open sets X whose boundary does not contain any straight line, respectively. Moreover, if the polynomial P acts along a subspace and is elliptic there, Nakane [11] gave a geometric characterization when X is P-convex for supports. A more convenient geometric characterization for this class of operators can be found in [5, Theorem 10.8.5].

In 1962, Hörmander showed [3] that $P(D)$ is surjective as an operator on $\mathscr{D}'(X)$ if and only if X is P-convex for supports as well as P-convex for singular supports, where the later means that for every compact subset K of X there is another compact subset L of X such that for each $u \in \mathscr{E}'(X)$ with $\operatorname{sing\,supp} P(-D)u \subseteq K$ it follows that $\operatorname{sing\,supp} u \subseteq L$. Though better understood than P-convexity for supports, giving geometric characterization for P-convexity for singular supports for concrete differential operators $P(D)$ is not a triviality, see e.g. [5, Chapter 10], [4], [2], and [7].

It is well-known that a necessary condition for an open subset $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ to be P-convex for supports, respectively P-convex for singular supports, is that the boundary distance of X satisfies the minimum principle in every characteristic hyperplane, respectively in certain affine subspaces related to P, resp. (cf. [5, Theorem 10.8.1, Corollary 11.3.2, resp.]). In section 2, sufficient conditions for P-convexity for (singular) supports for X are given in terms of the minimum principle for the boundary distance of X being valid in certain affine subspaces related to P. This enables to give characterizations of the convexity conditions for certain types of differential operators.

In section 3 the sufficient condition for P-convexity for singular supports is used to give for certain differential operators a positive solution to the problem of parameter dependence for solutions of partial differential equations posed by Bonet and Domański in [1]. Given a surjective differential operator $P(D)$ on $\mathscr{D}'(X)$ for some open $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, when is the augmented operator $P^+(D)$ surjective on $\mathscr{D}'(X \times \mathbb{R})$, where $P^+(x_1, \dots, x_{n+1}) = P(x_1, \dots, x_n)$? This problem is connected with the parameter dependence of solutions of the differential equation

$$P(D)u_\lambda = f_\lambda,$$

see [1]. As shown by Bonet and Domański in [1, Proposition 8.3] a positive answer to this problem is equivalent to the kernel of the differential operator on $\mathscr{D}'(X)$ having the linear topological invariant $(P\Omega)$, and has additional consequences, i.e. surjectivity of $P^+(D)$ is equivalent to the surjectivity of $P(D)$ on the vector valued distributions $\mathscr{D}'(X, \Lambda_r(\alpha)')$, where $\Lambda_r(\alpha)$ is a power series space, like e.g. spaces of smooth functions on a compact manifold, or spaces of holomorphic functions on nice domains.

It follows from a well-known result due to Vogt [16, Proposition 3.4] that in case of an elliptic operator the augmented operator is always surjective. In [7] it is shown that for $n = 2$ surjectivity of $P(D)$ always implies surjectivity of the augmented operator $P^+(D)$ whereas in [8] for arbitrary $n \geq 3$ a hypoelliptic differential operator $P(D)$ is constructed such that for some open $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ $P(D)$ is surjective on $\mathscr{D}'(X)$ but $P^+(D)$ is not surjective on $\mathscr{D}'(X \times \mathbb{R})$. In section 3 we show that the problem of Bonet and Domański has always a positive solution for certain semi-elliptic differential operators including the heat operator, and for operators acting along a subspace of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and being elliptic there, thus generalizing the above mentioned result of Vogt. Since the heat operator is hypoelliptic its kernel in $\mathscr{D}'(X)$ coincides as a locally convex space with its kernel in $\mathscr{E}(X)$. Therefore, it follows that whenever the heat operator is surjective on $\mathscr{E}(X)$ its kernel has the property (Ω) of Vogt [16].

Throughout the paper we use standard notation from the theory of partial differential operators, see e.g. [5].

2. Conditions for P-convexity

Recall that a real-valued function f on $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is said to satisfy the minimum principle in a closed subset F of $\mathbb{R}^n$ if for every compact set $K \subseteq F \cap X$ we have

$$\min_{x \in K} f(x) = \min_{\partial_F K} f(x),$$

where $\partial_F K$ denotes the boundary of K in F. We set the boundary distance d_X of X to be the mapping

$$d_X : X \to \mathbb{R}, x \mapsto \operatorname{dist}(x, X^c),$$

where the distance is taken with respect to the Euclidean norm $|x|$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$. The next theorem gives sufficient conditons for P-convexity for (singular) supports in terms of d_X satisfying the minimum principle in certain affine subspaces related to

P, and it is the main result in this section. In its formulation we use the following functional defined on the subspaces of $\mathbb{R}^n$. It was introduced be Hörmander in the context of continuation of differentiability for solutions of partial differential equations, cf. [5, Section 11.3].

For a subspace $V \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ we set

$$\sigma_P(V) = \inf_{t\geq 1} \liminf_{\xi\to\infty} \frac{\tilde{P}_V(\xi,t)}{\tilde{P}(\xi,t)},$$

where for $t \geq 1$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$

$$\tilde{P}_V(\xi,t) := \sup_{x\in V, |x|\leq t} |P(x+\xi)|,\ \tilde{P}(\xi,t) := \tilde{P}_{\mathbb{R}^n}(\xi,t).$$

Moreover, for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we use the abbreviation $\sigma_P(x) := \sigma_P(\operatorname{span}\{x\})$.

Theorem 1. *Let P be a polynomial with principal part P_m and let $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be open. Moreover, let $W \neq \{0\}$ be a subspace of $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that d_X satisfies the minimum principle in $x + W$ for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$.*

i) *If $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n; P_m(x) = 0\} \subseteq W^\perp$ then X is P-convex for supports.*
ii) *If $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n; \sigma_P(x) = 0\} \subseteq W^\perp$ then X is P-convex for singular supports.*

P-convexity for supports for polynomials for which the zero set of its principal part is contained in a non-trivial subspace of $\mathbb{R}^n$ was also considered by Zachmanoglou [17]. In order to proof Theorem 1 we first give a useful characterization of when d_X satisfies the minimum principal in every affine subspace parallel to a given subspace W. Therefore, we introduce the following notion.

Definition 2. Let W be a subspace of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$. For an interval $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ a curve $\gamma : I \to X$ is called *W-regular* if γ is continuous, piecewise continuously differentiable and $\gamma'(t) \in W$ for all $t \in I$ where γ is differentiable.

For $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ we denote by $\partial_\infty X$ the boundary of X in the one-point compactification of $\mathbb{R}^n$, thus $\infty \in \partial_\infty X$ whenever X is an unbounded subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$. For a curve $\gamma : I \to X$ we set $|\gamma| := \gamma(I)$

Proposition 3. *Let W be a subspace of $\mathbb{R}^n$, $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be open, $K \subseteq X$ be compact and non-empty, and $x \in X\backslash K$ such that $|\gamma| \cap K \neq \emptyset$ for every W-regular curve $\gamma : [0,\infty) \to X$ with $\gamma(0) = x$ and $\liminf_{t\to\infty} \operatorname{dist}(\gamma(t), \partial_\infty X) = 0$.*

Then, the connected component Z in $(x + W) \cap (X\backslash K)$ which contains x is bounded and $\partial_{x+W} Z$, the boundary of Z in $x + W$, is contained in $K \cap (x + W)$.

Proof. Assume that Z is unbounded. For notational convenience let us define $V := (x+W)\cap(X\backslash K)$. Because V is locally pathwise connected and Z is open in V, thus locally pathwise connected, too, the connectedness of Z implies that Z is pathwise connected. Hence, there is a continuous, piecewise continuously differentiable curve $\gamma : [0,\infty) \to Z$ with $\gamma(0) = x$ and $\lim_{t\to\infty} |\gamma(t)| = \infty$. Because $Z \subseteq X\backslash K$ this contradicts the hypothesis.

Thus, Z is a bounded subset of V. Because the inclusion $V \hookrightarrow x + W$ is a homeomorphism onto its image and because Z is open and closed in V so that

$\partial_V Z = \emptyset$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_{x+W} Z &= \Big((\partial_{x+W} Z) \cap V\Big) \cup \Big((\partial_{x+W} Z) \cap (K \cap (x+W))\Big) \\ &\quad \cup \Big((\partial_{x+W} Z) \cap ((\mathbb{R}^n \backslash X) \cap (x+W))\Big) \\ &= \partial_V Z \cup \Big((\partial_{x+W} Z) \cap (K \cap (x+W))\Big) \\ &\quad \cup \Big((\partial_{x+W} Z) \cap ((\mathbb{R}^n \backslash X) \cap (x+W))\Big) \\ &= \Big((\partial_{x+W} Z) \cap (K \cap (x+W))\Big) \\ &\quad \cup \Big((\partial_{x+W} Z) \cap ((\mathbb{R}^n \backslash X) \cap (x+W))\Big).\end{aligned}$$

So, if we can show that $(\partial_{x+W} Z) \cap ((\mathbb{R}^n \backslash X) \cap (x+W)) = \emptyset$ the proposition is proved.

Assume that there is

$$y \in (\partial_{x+W} Z) \cap ((\mathbb{R}^n \backslash X) \cap (x+W)).$$

Because $V \hookrightarrow x+W$ is a homeomorphism onto its image it follows that Z is a pathwise connected subset of $x+W$. Denote by C the closure of Z in $x+W$. Since Z is open in $x+W$ it follows that there is a continuous, piecewise continuously differentiable curve $\gamma : [0,\infty) \to Z$ with $\gamma(0) = x$ and $\lim_{t\to\infty} \gamma(t) = y$.

Indeed, there is y_1 in $B(y,1) \cap Z$ and a continuous, piecewise continuously differentiable $\alpha_1 : [0,1] \to Z$ with $\alpha_1(0) = x$, $\alpha_1(1) = y_1$. Next, as we can find $y_2 \in B(y, 1-|y_1|) \cap Z$ there is a continuous, piecewise continuously differentiable $\alpha_2 : [1,2] \to Z$ with $\alpha_2(1) = y_1$ and $\alpha_2(2) = y_j$. Preceding in this way we obtain a sequence $(y_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ in Z with $y = \lim_{j\to\infty} y_j$ and a sequence of continuous, piecewise continuously differentiable curves $\alpha_j : [j-1, j] \to Z$ with $\alpha_j(j-1) = y_{j-1}$ and $\alpha_j(j) = y_j$. Joining these curves gives the desired γ.

Clearly, γ is a W-regular curve with $\gamma(0) = x$ and $\liminf_{t\to\infty} \operatorname{dist}(\gamma(t), X^c) = 0$. From the hypothesis it follows $|\gamma| \cap K \neq \emptyset$ contradicting $Z \subseteq X \backslash K$. □

We now give a characterization of when d_X satisfies the minimum principle in every affine subspace parallel to a given subspace W in terms of W-regular curves.

Lemma 4. *Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be open and let $\{0\} \neq W \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a subspace. Then the following are equivalent.*

i) *The boundary distance*

$$d_X : X \to \mathbb{R}, x \mapsto \mathit{dist}(x, X^c)$$

satisfies the minimum principle in $x+W$ for each $x \in X$.

ii) *For each compact subset $K \subseteq X$ and every*

$$x \in \{y \in X;\, d_X(y) < \mathit{dist}(K, X^c)\}$$

there is a W-regular curve $\gamma : [0,\infty) \to X$ with $\gamma(0) = x$ and $|\gamma| \cap K = \emptyset$ such that $\liminf_{t\to\infty} \mathit{dist}(\gamma(t), \partial_\infty X) = 0$.

Proof. We first show that ii) implies i). So let $K \subseteq (x+W) \cap X$ be compact for some $x \in X$. Assume that there is $x_0 \in K$ with $d_X(x_0) < \operatorname{dist}(\partial_{x+W} K, X^c)$. Applying ii) to the compact subset $\partial_{x+W} K$ of X there is a W-regular curve $\gamma : [0,\infty) \to X$ with $\gamma(0) = x_0$, $\liminf_{t\to\infty} \operatorname{dist}(\gamma(t), \partial_\infty X) = 0$ and $|\gamma| \cap \partial_{x+W} K = \emptyset$. Because γ is W-regular and because $x_0 \in K \subseteq x+W$ it follows that $|\gamma| \subseteq (x+W) \cap X$. Since $\gamma(0) = x_0$ is contained in $\operatorname{int}_{x+W}(K)$, the interior of K with respect to $x+W$, and since $\liminf_{t\to\infty} \operatorname{dist}(\gamma(t), \partial_\infty X) = 0$ it follows from the compactness of $K \subseteq X$ that $|\gamma| \cap \partial_{x+W} K \neq \emptyset$ which gives a contradiction.

In order to show that i) implies ii), assume that for some compact $K \subseteq X$ there is $x_0 \in \{y \in X;\, d_X(y) < \operatorname{dist}(K, X^c)\}$ such that every W-regular curve $\gamma : [0,\infty) \to X$ with $\gamma(0) = x_0$ and $\liminf_{t\to\infty} \operatorname{dist}(\gamma(t), \partial_\infty X) = 0$ intersects K.

Let Z be the connected component of $(x_0 + W) \cap (X \backslash K)$ containing x_0. From the assumption on x_0 and proposition 3 it follows that Z is a bounded subset of $x_0 + W$ and

$$\partial_{x_0+W} Z \subseteq K. \tag{1}$$

Let us denote the closure of Z in $x_0 + W$ by C. Then C is a compact subset of $(x_0 + W) \cap X$ by proposition 3. By i) we obtain

$$\min_{x\in C} d_X(x) = \min_{x\in\partial_{x_0+W} C} d_X(x).$$

Because of $x_0 \in C$ this yields

$$d_X(x_0) \geq \min_{x\in\partial_{x_0+W} C} d_X(x) = \operatorname{dist}(\partial_{x_0+W} Z, X^c) \geq \operatorname{dist}(K, X^c)$$

where we used (1) in the last inequality. But this contradicts $d_X(x_0) < \operatorname{dist}(K, X^c)$. □

Proof of Theorem 1. In the sequel we denote the convex hull of $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ by $[x, y]$. In order to prove i) we fix $u \in \mathscr{E}'(X)$ and set $K := \operatorname{supp} \check{P}(D)u$, where as usual $\check{P}(\xi) = P(-\xi)$. Moreover, we fix $x \in \{y \in X;\, \operatorname{dist}(y, X^c) < \operatorname{dist}(K, X^c)\}$. Because d_X satisfies the minimum principle in $y + W$ for every $y \in X$ it follows from lemma 4 that there is a W-regular curve $\gamma : [0,\infty) \to X$ such that $\gamma(0) = x$, $|\gamma| \cap K = \emptyset$, and $\liminf_{t\to\infty} \operatorname{dist}(\gamma(t), X^c) = 0$.

Because $\operatorname{supp} u$ is a compact subset of X it follows from the properties of γ that there is $T > 0$ with $\gamma(T) \notin \operatorname{supp} u$. Moreover, we can find $\varepsilon > 0$ such that the open ball $B(\gamma(T), \varepsilon)$ of radius ε about $\gamma(T)$ does not intersect $\operatorname{supp} u$, $\gamma([0,T]) + B(0,\varepsilon) \subseteq X$ and $K \cap (\gamma([0,T]) + B(0,\varepsilon)) = \emptyset$, where $\gamma([0,T]) + B(0,\varepsilon) = \{y + z;\, y \in \gamma([0,T]), z \in B(0,\varepsilon)\}$.

Next, we choose $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \ldots < t_k = T$ such that for each $j = 1, \ldots, k$ the restriction of γ to $[t_{j-1}, t_j]$ is continuously differentiable and

$$\Big|\int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j} \gamma'(t)dt\Big| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

We define

$$f : [0,k] \to \mathbb{R}^n, s \mapsto \gamma(t_{\lfloor s\rfloor}) + (s - \lfloor s\rfloor) \int_{t_{\lfloor s\rfloor}}^{t_{\lfloor s\rfloor+1}} \gamma'(t)dt,$$

where $\lfloor s\rfloor$ denotes the integer part of s. Then f is a polygonal curve in $x + W$ by the W-regularity of γ with $f([j-1, j]) = [\gamma(t_{j-1}), \gamma(t_j)], j = 1, \ldots, k$. Moreover, due to the choice of ε, we have $|f| + B(0, \frac{\varepsilon}{2}) \subseteq X \backslash K$.

For $N \in \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n;\, P_m(y) = 0\} \backslash \{0\}$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ let

$$H_{N,\alpha} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n;\, \langle x, N\rangle = \alpha\}$$

be the corresponding characteristic hyperplane. Since $[\gamma(t_{k-1}), \gamma(T)] \subseteq x + W$ and $N \in W^\perp$ it follows that $H_{N,\alpha}$ intersects $B(\gamma(T), \varepsilon)$ whenever $H_{N,\alpha}$ intersects $[\gamma(t_{k-1}), \gamma(T)] + B(0,\varepsilon)$. By the choice of ε we have $u_{|B(\gamma(T),\varepsilon)} = 0$ so that by [5, Theorem 8.6.8, vol. I] u vanishes in $[\gamma(t_{k-1}), \gamma(T)] + B(0,\varepsilon)$.

Iteration of the above argument yields that u vanishes in $|f| + B(0,\varepsilon)$, in particular $x = \gamma(0) = f(0)$ does not belong to $\operatorname{supp} u$. As x was an arbitrary point with $\operatorname{dist}(x, X^c) < \operatorname{dist}(K, X^c)$ it follows from the definition of K that

$$\operatorname{dist}(\operatorname{supp} u, X^c) \geq \operatorname{dist}(K, X^c) = \operatorname{dist}(\operatorname{supp} \check{P}(D), X^c).$$

Since trivially $\operatorname{dist}(\operatorname{supp} u, X^c) \leq \operatorname{dist}(\operatorname{supp} \check{P}(D)u, X^c)$ it follows from [5, Theorem 10.6.3, vol. II] that X is P-convex for supports.

In order to prove ii), we replace in the above arguments supp by $\operatorname{sing\,supp}$, $N \in \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n;\, P_m(y) = 0\}$ by $N \in \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n;\, (\sigma_{\check{P}}(y) =)\sigma_P(y) = 0\}$, and the reference to [5, Theorem 10.6.3, vol. I] by [2, Corollary 2]. □

As a corollary to Theorem 1 we obtain the next result characterizing P-convexity for supports for very special polynomials P. In particular, this characterization is applicable to the heat operator $P(D) = \Delta_x - \frac{\partial}{\partial t}$ and the Schrödinger operator $P(D) = \Delta_x + i\frac{\partial}{\partial t}$. This result can also be derived from [6, Theorem 5.1 and Proposition 2.2].

Corollary 5. *Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be open and let P be a polynomial with principal part P_m such that $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n;\, P_m(x) = 0\}$ is a one-dimensional subspace of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Then, the following are equivalent.*

i) *X is P-convex for supports.*
ii) *d_X satisfies the minimum principle in every characteristic hyperplane.*

Proof. We set $W := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n;\, P_m(x) = 0\}^\perp$. That ii) implies i) follows from Theorem 1 while the reverse implication is [5, Theorem 10.8.1, vol. II]. □

The analogous result for P-convexity for singular supports is the following.

Corollary 6. *Let $P \neq 0$ be a polynomial such that $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n;\, \sigma_P(x) = 0\} = W^\perp$ for some subspace $W \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\sigma_P(W^\perp) = 0$. Then, for $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ the following are equivalent.*

i) *X is P-convex for singular supports.*
ii) *d_X satisfies the minimum principle in $x + W$ for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$.*

Proof. That ii) implies i) follows again from Theorem 1 while the reverse implication is [5, Corollary 11.3.2, vol. II]. □

Remark 7. We do not know if the condition "$\sigma_P(W^\perp) = 0$" in Corollary 6 is redundant.

Lemma 8. *Let $P \in \mathbb{C}[X_1, \ldots, X_n]$ be a polynomial which acts along a subspace $W \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and is elliptic as a polynomial on W. Then $\sigma_P(V) = 0$ holds for a subspace $V \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ if and only if $V \subseteq W^\perp$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality we may assume $W = \mathbb{R}^k \times \{0\}$ with $1 \leq k \leq n$ and $0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$. For $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ we denote $x' = (x_1, \ldots, x_k)$.

Clearly, $V \subseteq W^\perp$ implies $\sigma_P(V) = 0$. On the other hand, if V is not a subspace of $W^\perp$ there is $x \in V$ with $|x'| = 1$. From the ellipticity of P on $\mathbb{R}^k$ it follows that for some $C > 0$ we have

$$\forall\, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n :\, C|\xi'|^m \leq P(\xi'),$$

where $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ is the degree of P. Thus, for $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $t > 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{P}_{\mathrm{span}\{x\}}(\xi,t)^2 &= \sup_{|\theta|\le t} |P(\xi'+\theta x')|^2 \\
&\ge C \sup_{|\theta|\le t} |\xi'+\theta x'|^{2m} \\
&\ge \frac{C}{2}\Big(|\xi'+tx'|^{2m} + |\xi'-tx'|^{2m}\Big) \\
&= \frac{C}{2}\Big(\big(\sum_{j=1}^k (\xi_j+tx_j)^2\big)^m + \big(\sum_{j=1}^k (\xi_j-tx_j)^2\big)^m\Big) \\
&\ge \frac{C}{2}\Big(\sum_{j=1}^k \big((\xi_j+tx_j)^{2m} + (\xi_j-tx_j)^{2m}\big)\Big) \\
&\ge C\Big(\sum_{j=1}^k \xi_j^{2m} + t^{2m}\sum_{j=1}^k x_j^{2m}\Big).
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, for suitable $C', D > 0$ we have for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $t > 0$

$$\tilde{P}(\xi,t)^2 \le C'(t^{2m} + |\xi'|^{2m}) \le D(t^{2m} + \sum_{j=1}^k \xi_j^{2m}).$$

If we set $\alpha := \sum_{j=1}^k x_j^{2m}$ and take into account that $\alpha > 0$ because of $|x'| = 1$ it follows that for every $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $t > 0$ we have

$$\frac{\tilde{P}_{\mathrm{span}\{x\}}(\xi,t)^2}{\tilde{P}(\xi,t)^2} \ge \frac{C\Big(\sum_{j=1}^k \xi_j^{2m} + t^{2m}\alpha\Big)}{D(\sum_{j=1}^k \xi_j^{2m} + t^{2m})} \ge \frac{C}{D}\alpha > 0,$$

so that

$$\sigma_P(V) \ge \sigma_P(x) \ge \frac{C}{D}\alpha > 0$$

which proves the lemma. □

Theorem 9. *Let $P \in \mathbb{C}[X_1,\dots,X_n]$ be a polynomial which acts along a subspace $W \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and is elliptic as a polynomial on W. Then, for an open subset $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ the following are equivalent.*

i) *X is P-convex for supports.*
ii) *X is P-convex for singular supports.*
iii) *d_X satisfies the minimum principle in $x + W$ for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$.*

Proof. That i) and iii) are equivalent is [5, Theorem 10.8.5] while the equivalence of ii) and iii) follows from Corollary 6 and Lemma 8. □

Remark 10. Observe that Theorem 9 is in particular applicable to first order differential operators $P(D) = \langle N, D\rangle + c$ where $N \in \mathbb{C}^n\backslash\{0\}, c \in \mathbb{C}$. In this case $W = \mathrm{span}\{\mathrm{Re}\ N, \mathrm{Im}\ N\}$.

3. Surjectivity of certain augmented differential operators

In this section we show that for certain partial differential operators, including the heat operator, surjectivity of $P(D)$ on $\mathscr{D}'(X)$ implies the surjectivity of the augmented operator $P^+(D)$ on $\mathscr{D}'(X \times \mathbb{R})$, where $P^+(x_1,\dots,x_n,x_{n+1}) := P(x_1,\dots,x_n)$. It was shown in [7], that in case of $n = 2$ the augmented operator of a surjective partial differential operator $P(D)$ is always surjective while in [8] for $n \ge 3$ a hypoelliptic differential operator $P(D)$ was constructed for which there is some open $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $P(D)$ is surjective on $\mathscr{D}'(X)$ while the augmented

operator $P^+(D)$ is not surjective on $\mathscr{D}'(X\times\mathbb{R})$. Thus, although not true in general, for certain differential operators, including the heat operator, the problem of parameter dependence for solutions of partial differential equations [1, Problem 9.1] has a positive solution. As stated in the introduction, the kernels of these differential operators in $\mathscr{D}'(X)$ therefore possess the linear topological invariant $(P\Omega)$.

Apart from the functional σ_P we also use

$$\sigma_P^0(V) := \inf_{t\geq 1,\xi\in\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{\tilde{P}_V(\xi,t)}{\tilde{P}(\xi,t)},$$

where $V\subseteq\mathbb{R}^n$ is again a subspace. Moreover, we set $\sigma_p^0(y) := \sigma_P^0(\operatorname{span}\{y\})$ for $y\in\mathbb{R}^n$. Furthermore, we define

$$\pi:\mathbb{R}^{n+1}\to\mathbb{R}^n, (x_1,\dots,x_{n+1})\mapsto(x_1,\dots,x_n)$$

and we set $A' := \pi(A)$ for $A\subseteq\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, respectively $x' := \pi(x)$ for $x\in\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. The reason for using σ_P^0 is the following lemma. For its proof see [2, Lemma 1].

Lemma 11. *For a polynomial $P\in\mathbb{C}[X_1,\dots,X_n]$ and a subspace $V\subseteq\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ the following hold.*

i) $\sigma_{P^+}(V'\times\mathbb{R}) = \sigma_{P^+}(V'\times\{0\}) = \sigma_P^0(V')$.
ii) $\sigma_{P^+}(V) = 0$ *if and only if* $\sigma_P^0(V') = 0$.

We continue with an easy geometrical observation. For its proof we need the following trivial proposition.

Proposition 12. *Let X and Y be Hausdorff topological spaces, $f:X\to Y$ continuous and open, and let $K\subseteq X$ be compact. Then $\partial f(K)\subseteq f(\partial K)$.*

Proof. Let $y\in\partial f(K)$ and $x\in K$ with $f(x)=y$. Suppose that $x\notin\partial K$. Then there is an open neighborhood V of x such that $V\subseteq K$. Since f is open it follows that $f(V)$ is an open neighborhood of $y=f(x)$ which is contained in $f(K)$ contradicting $y\in\partial f(K)$. □

Proposition 13. *Let $X\subseteq\mathbb{R}^n$ be open and $F\subseteq\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ be closed. If d_X satisfies the minimum principle in F' then $d_{X\times\mathbb{R}}$ satisfies the minimum principle in F. Moreover, if F is an affine subspace such that $\{x_{n+1};\, x\in F\}$ is bounded and $d_{X\times\mathbb{R}}$ satisfies the minimum principle in F then d_X satisfies the minimum principle in F'.*

Proof. Let d_X satisfies the minimum principle in F'. Let $K\subseteq F\cap(X\times\mathbb{R})$ be compact. We assume that there is $x_0\in K$ such that

$$d_{X\times\mathbb{R}}(x_0) < \min_{x\in\partial_F K} d_{X\times\mathbb{R}}(x).$$

Since $d_{X\times\mathbb{R}}(x) = d_X(x')$ it follows

$$\begin{aligned} d_X(x_0') &= d_{X\times\mathbb{R}}(x_0) < \min_{x\in\partial_F K} d_{X\times\mathbb{R}}(x) \\ &= \min\{d_X(x');x'\in\pi_{|F}(\partial_F K)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Proposition 12 to $\pi_{|F}F\to F'$ we obtain $\pi_{|F}(\partial_F K)\supseteq\partial_{F'}K'$ so that the previous inequality yields

$$d_X(x_0') < \min_{\partial_{F'}K'} d_X(x').$$

Since $x_0'\in K'$ and since d_X satisfies the minimum principle this gives a contradiction. Thus

$$d_{X\times\mathbb{R}}(x_0) \geq \min_{x\in\partial_F K} d_{X\times\mathbb{R}}(x)$$

for every $x_0\in K$ so that $d_{X\times\mathbb{R}}$ satisfies the minimum principle in F.

Now assume that F is an affine subspace such that $\{x_{n+1};\, x \in F\}$ is bounded and that $d_{X\times\mathbb{R}}$ satisfies the minimum principle in F. Since $\{x_{n+1};\, x \in F\}$ is bounded the subspace $F - F$ of $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ is contained in $\mathbb{R}^n \times \{0\}$. It follows for $x, y \in F$ with $\pi(x) = \pi(y)$ that $x' = y'$ and because of $x - y \in F - F \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \times \{0\}$ we obtain $x = y$. Therefore, $\pi_{|F}$ is injective so that

$$\pi_{|F} : F \to F'$$

is a homeomorphism.

Let $K \subseteq F' \cap X$ be compact. It follows that $K \times \mathbb{R} \subseteq (F' \times \mathbb{R}) \cap (X \times \mathbb{R})$, thus $(K \times \mathbb{R}) \cap F \subseteq F \cap (X \times \mathbb{R})$. Because $\{x_{n+1};\, x \in F\}$ is bounded

$$L := (K \times \mathbb{R}) \cap F$$

is a compact subset of $F \cap (X \times \mathbb{R})$ with $\pi(L) = K$. Therefore, and since $d_{X\times\mathbb{R}}$ satisfies the minimum principle in F we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\min_{x'\in K} d_X(x') &= \min\{d_X(x');\, x' \in \pi(L)\} = \min\{d_X(\pi(x));\, x \in L\} \\
&= \min_{x\in L} d_{X\times\mathbb{R}}(x) = \min_{x\in \partial_F L} d_{X\times\mathbb{R}}(x) \\
&= \min\{d_X(x');\, x' \in \pi_{|F}(\partial_F L)\} \\
&= \min\{d_X(x');\, x' \in \partial'_F K\} = \min_{x'\in\partial'_F K} d_X(x'),
\end{aligned}$$

where we used that $\pi_{|F}$ is a homeomorphism onto F' and $\pi(L) = K$ in the last step. □

The next proposition will be useful in the proof of the following theorem.

Proposition 14. *Let P be a polynomial and let $V \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a subspace such that P vanishes on V. Then*

$$\forall\, x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \xi \in V :\ P(x + \xi) = P(x),$$

i.e. P acts along $V^\perp$.

Proof. By an appropriate linear change of coordinates we may assume without loss of generality that $V = \mathbb{R}^k \times \{0\}^{n-k}$ with $k = \dim V$. Since P vanishes on V it follows with Taylor's Theorem

$$\forall\, x \in \mathbb{R}^k :\ 0 = P(x, 0) = \sum_{\alpha\in\mathbb{N}_0^k} \frac{\partial^{(\alpha,0)} P(0)}{\alpha!} x^\alpha$$

so that $\partial^\alpha P(0) = 0$ for every $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n \cap V$. Since $\xi_{k+1} = \ldots = \xi_n = 0$ for every $\xi \in V$ this implies

$$P(x + \xi) = \sum_{\alpha\in\mathbb{N}_0^n\cap V^\perp} \frac{\partial^\alpha P(0)}{\alpha!}(x + \xi)^\alpha = \sum_{\alpha\in\mathbb{N}_0^n\cap V^\perp} \frac{\partial^\alpha P(0)}{\alpha!} x^\alpha = P(x)$$

for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\xi \in V$. □

Recall that a polynomial P is called semi-elliptic if it is possible to write

$$P(\xi) = \sum_{|\alpha:\mathbf{m}|\le 1} c_\alpha \xi^\alpha$$

such that

$$\forall\, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n\backslash\{0\} : \sum_{|\alpha:\mathbf{m}|=1} c_\alpha \xi^\alpha \neq 0,$$

where $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$ and $|\alpha : \mathbf{m}| = \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j/m_j$. With $m_1 = 1$ and $m_j = 2$ for $j > 1$ it follows that the polynomial inducing the heat operator is semi-elliptic.

Theorem 15. *Let $P \in \mathbb{C}[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ be a semi-elliptic polynomial with principal part P_m and let $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be open. Then the following are equivalent.*

i) *$X \times \mathbb{R}$ is P^+-convex for singular supports.*
ii) *X is P_m-convex for supports.*
iii) *X is P_m-convex for singular supports.*
iv) *d_X satisfies the minimum principle in $x + \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n;\, P_m(y) = 0\}^\perp$ for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$.*

Proof. It is shown in [2, Proposition 2, Lemma 3] that $Z := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n;\, P_m(x) = 0\}$ is a subspace of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and that $\sigma_{P^+}(V) = 0$ if and only if V is a subspace of $Z \times \mathbb{R}$. In particular,

$$\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}; \sigma_{P^+}(x) = 0\} = Z \times \mathbb{R} = (Z^\perp \times \{0\})^\perp. \tag{2}$$

Since $\sigma_{P^+}(Z \times \mathbb{R}) = 0$ by Lemma 11 it follows from [5, Corollary 11.3.2] that $d_{X \times \mathbb{R}}$ satisfies the minimum principle in $x + (Z \times \mathbb{R})^\perp$ for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ if $X \times \mathbb{R}$ is P^+-convex for singular supports. Proposition 13 therefore implies that d_X satisfies the minimum principle in every affine subspace parallel to $Z^\perp$ if $X \times \mathbb{R}$ is P^+-convex for singular supports. Thus, i) implies iv).

On the other hand, if d_X satisfies the minimum principle in every affine subspace parallel to $Z^\perp$ it follows from Proposition 13 that $d_{X \times \mathbb{R}}$ satisfies the minimum principle in every affine subspace parallel to $(Z \times \mathbb{R})^\perp = Z^\perp \times \{0\}$. From (2) together with Theorem 1 it therefore follows that $X \times \mathbb{R}$ is P^+-convex for singular supports. Hence, iv) implies i).

In order to prove the remaining equivalences, we observe that by Proposition 14 P_m is a polynomial acting along the subspace $Z^\perp$. Since $Z \cap Z^\perp = \{0\}$ P_m is elliptic as a polynomial on $Z^\perp$ so that Theorem 9 yields the equvalences of ii), iii), and iv). □

We are now able to prove the main result of this section. Part i) of the following theorem generalizes a result of Vogt [16] about elliptic differential operators. Part ii) is in particular applicable to the heat operator.

Theorem 16. *Let P be a polynomial with principal part P_m and let $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be open such that $P(D) : \mathscr{D}'(X) \to \mathscr{D}'(X)$ is surjective. Then the augmented operator $P^+(D) : \mathscr{D}'(X \times \mathbb{R}) \to \mathscr{D}'(X \times \mathbb{R})$ is surjective if*

i) *P acts along a subspace W and is elliptic as a polynomial on W, or*
ii) *P is a semi-elliptic polynomial for which $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n;\, P_m(x) = 0\}$ is a one-dimensional subspace.*

Proof. Since $X \times \mathbb{R}$ is P^+-convex for supports whenever X is P-convex for supports by [2, Proposition 1] we only have to show that $X \times \mathbb{R}$ is P^+-convex for singular supports.

If P acts along a subspace and is elliptic there, the same holds for P^+. As $X \times \mathbb{R}$ is P^+-convex for supports it follows from Theorem 9 that $X \times \mathbb{R}$ is also P^+-convex for singular supports, proving i).

In case of ii) it follows from [5, Theorem 10.8.1] that d_X satisfies the minimum principle in every characteristic hyperplane. Thus, it follows from Theorem 15 that $X \times \mathbb{R}$ is P^+-convex for singular supports. □

Remark 17. a) Obviously, part i) of the above theorem is applicable to first order operators $P(D) = \langle D, N \rangle + c$. It was kindly pointed out to us by D. Vogt that in case of $N \in \mathbb{R}^n$ the surjectivity of $P(D)$ on $\mathscr{D}'(X)$ already implies the existence of a continuous linear right inverse of $P(D)$ on $\mathscr{D}'(X)$ (see [10]) and thus a continuous linear right inverse of $P^+(D)$ on $\mathscr{D}'(X \times \mathbb{R})$. In particular, $P^+(D)$ is then surjective on $\mathscr{D}'(X \times \mathbb{R})$.

b) As shown in the proof of Theorem 15, the principal part P_m of a semi-elliptic polynomial P acts along the subspace $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n;\, P_m(x) = 0\}^\perp$ and is elliptic as a polynomial on this subspace. Therefore, applying Theorem 16, Theorem 9, and Proposition 13, it follows that for a semi-elliptic polynomial the statement

v) $X \times \mathbb{R}$ is P_m^+-convex for singular supports.

can be added to the equivalences of Theorem 15.

References

[1] J. Bonet, P. Domański, *Parameter dependence of solutions of differential equations on spaces of distributions and the splitting of short exact sequences*, J. Funct. Anal. 230:329–381, 2006.

[2] L. Frerick, T. Kalmes, *Some results on surjectivity of augmented semi-elliptic differential operators*, Math. Ann. 347:81–94, 2010.

[3] L. Hörmander, *On the range of convolution operators*, Ann. of Math. 76 (1962), 148-170

[4] L. Hörmander, *On the existence and the regularity of solutions of linear pseudo-differential equations*, Ens. Math. 17:99-163, 1971.

[5] L. Hörmander, *The Analysis of Linear Partial Differential Operators I and II*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1983.

[6] L. Hörmander, *Local P-convexity*, J. Anal. Math. 80:101–141, 2000.

[7] T. Kalmes, *Some results on surjectivity of augmented differential operators*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 386:125–134, 2012.

[8] T. Kalmes, *The augmented operator of a surjective partial differential operator with constant coefficients need not be surjective*, Bull. London Math. Soc. 44:610–614, 2012.

[9] B. Malgrange, *Existence et approximation des solutions des équations aux dérivées partielles et des équations de convolution*, Ann. Inst. Fourier Grenoble, 6 (1955-1956), 271-355

[10] R. Meise, B.A. Taylor, and D. Vogt, *Characterization of the linear partial differential operators with constant coefficients that admit a continuous linear right inverse*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble), 40(3):619–655, 1990.

[11] S. Nakane, *P-Convexity with respect to differential operators which act on linear subspaces*, Proc. Japan Acad. 55 Ser. A: 343–347, 1979.

[12] J. Persson, *The wave operator and P-convexity*, Boll. Un. Mat. Ital. (5) 18-B: 591–604, 1981.

[13] J. Persson, *The geometry of P-convex sets*, Boll. Un. Mat. Ital. (7) 7-B: 549–573, 1993.

[14] K. Tintarev, *On the geometry of P-convex sets for operators of real principle type*, Israel J. Math. 64:195–206, 1988.

[15] K. Tintarev, *Characterization of P-convexity for supports in terms of tangent curves*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 164:590–596, 1992.

[16] D. Vogt, *On the Solvability of $P(D)f = g$ for vector valued functions*, RIMS Kokyoroku 508:168–181, 1983.

[17] E.C. Zachmanoglou, *An application of Holmgren's theorem and convexity with respect to differential operators with flat characteristic cones*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 140:109–115, 1969.

Technische Universität Chemnitz, Fakultät für Mathematik, 09107 Chemnitz, Germany

E-mail address: thomas.kalmes@mathematik.tu-chemnitz.de